# EVIDENTIARY HEARING

#### BEFORE THE

# CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	)	
Application for Certification for the Blythe Solar Energy Project by Palo Verde Solar I, LLC	) ) ) )	Docket No. 09-AFC-6

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

HEARING ROOM B

1516 NINTH STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2010 10:00 a.m.

Reported by:
Peter Petty, CER

Contract No. 170-09-002

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Karen Douglas, Chairman and Presiding Member

Robert B. Weisenmiller, Associate Member

## HEARING OFFICER, ADVISORS

Raoul Renaud, Hearing Officer

Eileen Allen, Advisor to Commissioner Weisenmiller

Panama Bartholomy, Advisor to Commissioner Douglas

Galen Lemei, Advisor to Commissioner Douglas

#### STAFF, CONSULTANTS AND STAFF WITNESSES

Lisa DeCarlo, Staff Counsel

Alan Solomon, Project Manager

Alan De Salvio (via teleconference) Roseana Navarro-Brasington (via teleconference) Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

Michael Donovan

Tannika Engelhard United States Fish & Wildlife Service

Amy Golden

Sara Keeler

Mark Masser (via teleconference) Bureau of Land Management

Magdalena Rodriguez (via teleconference) California Department of Fish and Game

Susan Sanders, PhD Aspen Environmental Group

John Thornton

William Walters (via teleconference)

# OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC ADVISER

Jennifer Jennings, Public Adviser

## APPLICANT

Scott Galati, Attorney Robert Gladden, Attorney Galati and Beck

Alice Harron Elizabeth Ingram Solar Millennium, LLC

Ari Bachrach (via teleconference) Carl Lindner (via teleconference) AECOM

William Graham Jennifer Guigliano AECOM

#### INTERVENORS

Elizabeth Klebaner, Attorney Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo representing California Unions for Reliable Energy (CURE)

# ALSO PRESENT

Daniel Curtin California Conference of Carpenters

Dale Evenson (via teleconference) Jason Neuman (via teleconference) Riverside County Fire Department

iv INDEX Page Proceedings 1 Call to Order and Introductions 1 General Instructions from Hearing Officer Renaud 3 4 Statement by Intervenor CURE Evidentiary Presentations Air Quality Witness Staff Alan De Salvio Direct Examination by Ms. DeCarlo 11 Summary of Topics by Mr. Galati 12 Biology Witnesses Applicant William Graham 32 Direct Examination by Mr. Galati Cross Examination by Ms. DeCarlo 35 Jennifer Guigliano Cross Examination by Ms. DeCarlo 35 Recalled by the Committee 79 Staff Susan Sanders, PhD 39,41 Direct Examination by Ms. DeCarlo Cross Examination by Mr. Galati 50 77 Recalled by the Committee Mark Masser Direct Examination by Ms. DeCarlo 40 Cross Examination by Mr. Galati 51

40,46

48

Direct Examination by Ms. DeCarlo

Cross Examination by Mr. Galati

Magdalena Rodriguez

vi

# EXHIBITS

# For the Applicant

Number	<u>Description</u>	<u>Identified</u>	Received
1-51	Multiple Exhibits	8	9

# For the Staff

Number	<u>Description</u>	<u>Identified</u>	Received
200-208	Multiple Exhibits	9	9
209	Final Determination of Compliar	nce 10	10
210	Blythe Solar Power Project Soil and Water Resources Conditions of Certification	57	

## PROCEEDINGS

10:12 a.m.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I'll open the proceedings with introductions. I'm Raoul Renaud, I'm the Energy Commission Hearing Advisor appointed to hear this matter.

To my right is Chairman Karen Douglas who is the Presiding Member of the Committee appointed to hear this matter and to my left is Commissioner Robert Weisenmiller, the Associate Member. To his left is Eileen Allen, Commissioner Weisenmiller's advisor, and I think there will be an adviser for Chairman Douglas eventually but not right now. Let me ask the representatives of the Commission staff to introduce themselves, please.

MS. DeCARLO: Good morning, Commissioners, Hearing Officer Renaud. This is Lisa DeCarlo, Energy Commission staff counsel. To my right is Alan Solomon, Energy Commission project manager. And we have various staff in the audience as well.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. And representatives of the applicant, introductions, please.

MR. GALATI: Good morning, Scott Galati representing Palo Verde Solar, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Solar Millennium on the Blythe Project. To my right is my co-counsel, Robert Gladden. To my left is -- do you want to introduce yourself or me?

MS. HARRON: I'm Alice Harron, senior director of development. Along with me is Elizabeth Ingram, project manager for Blythe. We have a lot of staff in the audience as well. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. And intervenor CURE? MS. KLEBANER: Good morning, Elizabeth Klebaner representing California Unions for Reliable Energy. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. And I know we have a telephone hookup, I have heard some people calling in. Is there anyone on the telephone who would like to introduce themselves? speak up. (Several people spoke at once.) MR. De SALVIO: Alan De Salvio and Roseana Navarro-Brasington from Mojave Desert AQMD. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good, welcome, sir. Anyone else? MR. EVENSON: Dale Evenson, Riverside County Fire Department. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good. MR. NEUMAN: Jason Neuman, Riverside County Fire Department.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BACHRACH: Ari Bachrach and Carl Lindner,

Anyone else.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD:

we're with AECOM; we're consultants to the applicant.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good, welcome.

Anyone else?

MS. ENGELHARD: Tannika Engelhard, US Fish and Wildlife Service.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good. Anyone else?

MR. WALTERS: William Walters, consultant with the Energy Commission for air quality.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Welcome. Anyone else?

All right, good. We have now been joined by Galen

Lemei who is the advisor to Chairman Douglas.

I'm not sure I said at the beginning what this is. This is the evidentiary hearing for the Blythe Solar Power Project, docket number 09-AFC-6. The evidentiary hearing is the time when the Committee hears the evidence presented by the parties and it is admitted officially into the record. And the record will form the basis of the Presiding Member's Proposed Decision, which would then go to the full Commission. Only the evidence which is admitted into the record today may be considered in the preparation of that decision so this is a very important proceeding for the case.

We are being recorded today. We have a licensed stenographic recorder present in the room. At the end of the proceedings that recording will be transcribed into a

written or typed booklet which will be posted on the Commission website and will be available for anyone and everyone to read.

Testimony today will be under oath. To the extent that parties wish to cross-examine witnesses who are present they will be able to do so as well.

The microphones we have in the room are new and quite sensitive. I think everyone can probably hear very well and I think the people on the phone can hear very well. You do need to press the speak button on your microphone in order to be heard; and if you want to silence that just press speak again.

We also have present in the room our Public Adviser. Would you care to stand up and introduce yourself, please.

MS. JENNINGS: Jennifer Jennings, Public Adviser.
HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Welcome and thank you.

All right. I think before we begin the evidentiary presentations I understand CURE has a statement to make.

MS. KLEBANER: Thank you, Hearing Officer Renaud.

Commissioner Douglas, Commissioner Weisenmiller.

California Unions for Reliable Energy is pleased to announce that we have reached an agreement with Palo Verde Solar I,

LLC, regarding all claims raised by CURE in this proceeding.

Pursuant to the terms of this agreement the applicant has committed to minimize and avoid impacts to desert washes and special status plants and wildlife during project operation and construction.

The project applicant has already, has also committed to provide funding to mitigate for impacts to seasonal forage as well as dispersal habitat for the Nelson Bighorn Sheep.

The applicant has also provided to CURE, pursuant to the terms of a non-disclosure agreement, the location and certain characteristics of lands planned for purchase as compensation lands.

And finally, the applicant has committed to remove unexploded ordnance and munitions and explosives of concern, as required, from the project site in order to protect worker safety. These acts will be undertaken prior to commencement of construction with regard to UXO removal.

The terms of our agreement are summarized in the joint statement that I will pass out to all the parties, the Commissioners and the Hearing Officer today and CURE and the applicant will docket the joint statement on the project website later this afternoon.

With this agreement together with the conditions of certification that have been worked out by the applicant and staff in the preceding days our concerns have been

addressed and as such we will not be submitting additional evidence into the record and we waive cross for staff's and the applicant's witnesses.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

MS. KLEBANER: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you very much for that statement. We appreciate that and we appreciate the efforts the parties have made towards resolution of issues.

With that I think we should begin our evidentiary presentations. Ms. DeCarlo, Mr. Galati, which of you wants to go first? We are here to listen attentively. I'll let you take over.

MR. GALATI: I guess I would start first by telling you that I hope to minimize the amount of time that the Committee is needed here today and tomorrow. I think that we have resolved many if not all of our issues.

Because we are still working on some final language in Biology, Soil and Water, Cultural Resources, we wanted to ask the Committee for, at some time, an opportunity for direction for a further workshop to finalize those. We have several of them in progress here and we hope to be able to come back after a workshop and be able to clarify exactly, do some joint exhibits and stipulations in some of these areas. But I think we are very close.

I think that Ms. DeCarlo had put together topics

in an order for where we want to go through. And if the Committee would indulge us if there is no objection, rather than swear in every witness for these areas where we are proceeding on declaration. In addition we have some modifications to our testimony if the Committee would accept an offer of proof from myself with no objection as opposed to swearing in a witness for some modifications to the testimony I think that would speed things along fairly well.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Does that sound acceptable to the staff, Ms. DeCarlo?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes it does.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, that will be fine.

MR. GALATI: I don't know what the Committee's preference is. We would probably -- I don't know if you want us to introduce exhibits all at the end of the proceedings or introduce as many exhibits as we can now. Whatever helps the Hearing Officer write the decision.

Some of the exhibits -- I can't introduce my entire exhibit list right now because I have exhibits that I know for a fact will change if we have conversations.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, I'm in favor of spending the least amount of clerical time on exhibits. And if the parties so stipulate the Committee would agree to a bulk, en masse, admission of exhibits if there are no

objections from any party.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. DeCARLO: No. We would just need to specify those exhibits that are withheld pending resolution of the other issues.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Fine, that sounds good.

MR. GALATI: Okay, I'll go ahead and start with that. I delivered to the Committee today and staff a revised exhibit list that added Exhibits 60 through 70.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Do you have any more copies of that? I have one. I think the Committee Members would like one. If not we can share.

Okay, so we'll follow along on your new, still warm exhibit list.

I should add for the record, Panama Bartholomy has joined us as well. He is also Chairman Douglas' advisor.

MR. GALATI: I think that what I would ask is that all the way from Exhibit 1 -- I would ask that Exhibits 1 through 51 be entered into the record. For the Committee's clarification, Exhibit 52 and Exhibit 53 include some of our opening and rebuttal testimony that I will need to point to you where there are some changes. So I thought that we would go from 1 to 51 at this stage.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes.

MR. GALATI: And then we could pick it up with the rest of the exhibits as they change after that, if that

would be okay. So my offer is to move Exhibits 1 through 51 into the record.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is there any objection from the staff?

MS. DeCARLO: No objection.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, those will be admitted then, thank you.

(Applicant's Exhibits 1-51 were admitted into the record.)

MR. GALATI: That's the end of, I guess, our preliminary moving of exhibits.

And I guess just for the record, we would not object to staff's moving exhibits 200 through 208 into the record.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, thank you. And we do have a new, updated staff exhibit list, which contains Exhibits 200 through 208. Is there a motion from staff?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes, staff would like to move those exhibits into the record at this moment.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is there any objection?

MR. GALATI: No objection.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Those are admitted, thank you.

(Staff's Exhibits 200 through 208 were admitted into the record.)

MS. DeCARLO: I'm not sure if Mr. Galati included the Final Determination of Compliance in his exhibit list. If not we can add it to ours as Exhibit 209. And the Air District is on the phone to sponsor that. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. MR. GALATI: It is not on our exhibit list. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: It is typically a staff exhibit so we'll make that 209. I take it there's no objection? MR. GALATI: No objection. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, that's admitted. (Staff's Exhibit 209 was admitted into the record.) HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: And in order to let the Air District witness go would you like to take care of his 16 sponsoring that right now? 17 18 MS. DeCARLO: Yes. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. I understand 20 he is on the phone so let's go ahead. MS. DeCARLO: Yes. I'm sorry, I didn't catch your name, from the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management 23 District? MR. De SALVIO: Alan De Salvio and Roseana 24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

21

22

25

Navarro-Brasington.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. DeCARLO:

Q Thank you for joining us today. Did you participate in the crafting of the Final Determination of Compliance?

A I did.

Q And are you sponsoring it today to enter into evidence at the Energy Commission's hearing on the Blythe Solar Power Project?

A I am.

MS. DeCARLO: He doesn't need to be sworn in, does

12 he?

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, I was thinking we probably should just for --

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Just for safety.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: But we'll do that at the end and bring in the testimony as if he had been sworn before.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MS. DeCARLO: Can he leave now or does he need to

24 remain?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is that testimony

complete or is that -- Yes.

MR. GALATI: No cross-examination.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: No cross, all right.

Sir, I am going to swear you in. Or if you want to do that. All right. The court reporter is going to swear you in.

Whereupon,

6

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### ALAN De SALVIO

Was duly sworn.

THE REPORTER: Very good, thank you. Could you also just state and spell your name for the record.

MR. De SALVIO: Alan De Salvio, A-L-A-N. The last name is D-E, space, capital S-A-L-V-I-O.

THE REPORTER: Thank you, sir.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. And you can now lower your hand. (Laughter)

And we have a stipulation, I believe, from the parties that Mr. De Salvio's testimony will be deemed sworn from the outset. Thank you. Good.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's that.

MR. GALATI: Maybe if I could just give a quick summary of where we are on the topics of why we want to have further discussions.

I guess I'll start with Soil and Water. Soil and

Water, we and staff have agreed to a revision to the modeling condition, which for all intents and purposes takes our disagreement and sort of sets it aside. And our particular disagreement is specifically related to how project pumping could affect the Colorado River. And so we have reached an accord where offsets and mitigations will be calculated in a way that's acceptable to staff and to us. And we will proceed in that way and not wade into the very extremely complex waters of the Colorado River Supreme Court regulation.

I think we are very comfortable with the language. Unfortunately we have a redline/strikeout version of that language that we worked on yesterday that we would like to clean up for you and so we would like that to be -- soil and water to be part of the workshop we are going to ask you to order us to do.

There are a couple of minor change to Soil and Water conditions of certification that we have agreed to as well and there is an outstanding discussion we need to have about the need for a particular Soil and Water Condition 17 that we haven't finished our discussions. So at a maximum we think that if we came back to you on Soil and Water, we estimate no more than ten minutes of direct examination if there is still a dispute on Soil and Water 17. Otherwise we would anticipate asking you to accept the evidence in the

record on the declaration.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

Anything to add, Ms. DeCarlo?

MS. DeCARLO: No. And staff expects the same amount of time for direct on our part.

 $\label{thm:mean} \mbox{\sc HEARING OFFICER RENAUD:} \mbox{\sc We'll put that one aside}$  then for later.

MR. GALATI: We will be asking you to modify the Worker Safety 7 condition. This is a condition that deals with the provision of funds for the fire department. We had a workshop on July 9th, on Friday, into the -- not the wee hours of the night but pretty late. Staff and the applicant agreed to modify this condition in a way that's acceptable to both parties.

I could actually mark this -- you know, I'll wait since this is after our testimony. This is one of the areas in which we would be modifying our testimony to now say we withdraw our previous request to modify Worker Safety 7 and agree to this version of Worker Safety 7. So we will be marking that as an exhibit later.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MR. GALATI: About a five minute cleanup, I think.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: So you will be presenting

the testimony at some point today?

MR. GALATI: Unless staff objected I didn't see

the need to bring a Worker Safety witness. I would be asking them to accept an offer of proof that we would modify our testimony in accordance with this condition.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, we'll proceed as you've suggested and when we hear the offer of proof we'll see if staff accepts it and we'll go.

MR. GALATI: The next area is in the area of Cultural Resources conditions. You know, we acknowledge that the staff originally started down a path with full coordination with BLM, down a programmatic agreement approach. And that in March, which we lovingly call "the divorce" between BLM and the CEC, that the staff sort of picked up the ball and needed to relook at how they were going to approach Cultural Resources.

So it took some while, it took awhile to get a set of cultural conditions for us to be able to have conversations. We have already had two workshops now in the last few days. In fact, maybe one in the last few hours on Cultural Resources. And we are continuing to make progress on agreeing on the language in those conditions. I am optimistic that we will do so, so we would like to have Cultural Resources part of your order to workshop so that we could come back and minimize the discussion on Cultural Resources as well.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. So I take it

Exhibit 62 may eventually change from what it is now, which that's your revisions, I believe, to the COCs.

MR. GALATI: That's correct.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Does that sound acceptable to staff?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, that's how we will proceed then.

MR. GALATI: Lastly.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Let me ask this. Would you anticipate calling any witnesses on Cultural or you don't know yet?

MR. GALATI: I'm sorry?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Would you anticipate calling witnesses on Cultural?

MR. GALATI: I have a witness here so I could ask, I could call a witness, they could sponsor the new exhibit and if the Committee had any questions. But I do -- if everything works out I don't anticipate needing to crossexamine the staff.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

MS. DeCARLO: And that's the same for staff. We have a witness who would agree to the agreed-upon conditions on the record and would be available for any questions.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good, thank you.

MR. GALATI: The last area is an area that I think we have spent considerable amount of time on with staff and the agencies and that's Biology. We worked late last night and are still exchanging some drafts. Quite frankly, the ball is in our court to produce the last draft. We've given that to staff now so we'll need to get together and talk about -- Let me tell you the areas that possibly remain for disputes. I'm going to again remain optimistic.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: The draft you mean is of the COCs or the sections?

MR. GALATI: Draft COCs.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MR. GALATI: We are now working with about four documents so that we could -- we have a document which we are calling Settled Conditions and Revisions to Conditions from the Revised Staff Assessment. We have agreed to certain conditions without any revision in the revised staff assessment and there's about three or four that we're still talking about.

(Music was broadcast over the

teleconference line.)

MR. GALATI: So we would like to continue to have those conversations.

The areas that we may be presenting testimony to you today deal with the impacts to the Bighorn Sheep,

possibly --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi, I'm calling you back regarding an account.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Hello. I think you may have the wrong number.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 1-4-5-9-6-2-1-9.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Whoever is speaking on the phone line here, we are in a hearing. I think you must have the wrong number.

Those of you who are listening in on the phones, if you want to carry on business and not have us hear you, and we would appreciate not hearing you, mute your phone. But do not place us on hold because sometimes hold has music and we would hear that and that would not help the proceedings here. Thank you. Okay, go ahead, sorry for the interruption.

MR. GALATI: Another possible area that we may be asking you to decide is whether the staff needs a condition on the US Fish and Wildlife Service raven management plan.

Another area is a criteria for mitigation lands for desert tortoise. A very limited five minutes of testimony, I think, discussion.

And other than that I think that we have really worked hard and the staff certainly has worked hard and I think that we have resolved a lot of issues in this project.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes.

MR. GALATI: One thing I'd like to say on the record is the applicant had no -- at considerable expense has agreed to mitigation for the desert tortoise at a one-to-one ratio to avoid continued discussions on habitat quality. I think that has allowed a lot of conversations to proceed so I would like to acknowledge that. That somewhere with Alice Harron and she was able to convince others in the company that that was, that was something that they could do. But that was -- it's a considerable expense.

I don't think that we have anything other than that and minor condition languages, language to conditions to discuss at the workshop. So I'm hoping that you would order that as well.

Lastly -- actually, the staff wants to comment on Biology.

MS. DeCARLO: No, I agree with your summarization of the outstanding issues. We will probably be testimony along those lines today.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you.

MR. GALATI: Lastly we have Traffic and
Transportation. And I think we are down to discussing one
condition on the need to have engineering controls related
to glint and glare and possibly flash for pilots. So we had
very productive discussions yesterday and we would like to

continue those as well today. If we do need to present live testimony in Traffic and Transportation, due to the unavailability of one of our witnesses we would ask for that to proceed tomorrow.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, that sounds fine to us; we have reserved both days. And so we can be here tomorrow for whenever you need us.

And would that be a workshop topic as well?

MR. GALATI: Yes, that would be a workshop topic.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay.

MR. GALATI: We also in the spirit of cooperation had two areas, Visual Cumulative Impacts and Land Use Cumulative Impacts, that we will be withdrawing that testimony. We would not be having a dispute on those areas.

I have an outstanding cleanup item that I need to ask to be discussed at the workshop too is there's a couple of conditions in Visual that I would like to talk to staff about.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, we'll add that to the list of possible items to be subject to Committee Order.

MR. GALATI: I think those are the areas that are, that are left open.

MS. DeCARLO: There's one outstanding item regarding Transmission System Engineering. Staff still has

not be able to obtain access to the Phase 2. We understand it has been delivered to the applicant, however, they are under a non-disclosure agreement and can't release it to staff. We are in the process of working with the Governor's Office and SCE and CAISO to try to obtain access to that document. It may be several weeks, however, before we are able to do so.

I am recommending that the record be left open for Transmission System Engineering to receive our analysis when it is completed, by declaration. At which point the parties can request, if they wish to, to have a hearing on the issue. Otherwise it would simply be entered into the record by declaration.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think we'll be able to manage that one way or another.

MR. GALATI: I'll wait to address you if for some reason that doesn't occur and we are not able to get staff's analysis in time to support the PMPD. Then at that time we'd be proposing to you a way to go forward.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

Anything else from either party on these bringingus-up-to-speed matters, which we really appreciate knowing where you are?

MR. GALATI: None from the applicant.

MS. DeCARLO: None from staff.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good.

Would you like to proceed then with the submission of topics by declaration at this time or what's your pleasure?

MR. GALATI: I actually moved all of my testimony in up until my testimony package.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's right.

MR. GALATI: I thought it might be cleaner for the record, since my testimony is combined into one exhibit, that once we had our workshop I could then tell you what parts of that are modified.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. And staff, you have already moved yours as well?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes we have.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think for the record then perhaps I ought to read into the record the topics that were submitted by declaration. And I am going to rely on Ms. DeCarlo's list, correct me if I'm wrong about anything.

Project Description, applicant's testimony.

Alternatives, Facility Design, Geology,
Paleontology and Minerals, Hazardous Materials Management,
Noise and Vibration, Power Plant Efficiency, Power Plant
Reliability, Public Health, Socioeconomics, Transmission
Line Safety and Nuisance, Waste Management and Air Quality.
Correct, applicant?

MR. GALATI: That's correct. I believe that
Worker Safety Fire Protection will be once we identify this
as an exhibit. I think we can actually do it now if you
want.

MS. DeCARLO: Actually, we have apparently just identified a typographical error in the amount that we indicated, so if I can read that to you now to see if we need to talk about this further. We have under number 2 of the condition, it's currently \$825,000, that's supposed to be \$850,000. That coincides with the verification below.

MR. GALATI: I think what I'll do is let me correct that and get a clean copy for the Committee.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay, okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: And subject to that correction then Worker Safety and Fire Protection is also submitted by declaration from both parties.

MR. GALATI: Yes.

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good.

MS. DeCARLO: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you.

MS. DeCARLO: I have one clarification on Air Quality. Mr. Galati, did you indicate that you have withdrawn your request?

MR. GALATI: Yes. In our testimony we have a request for some changes to staff's conditions that we no

longer are requesting.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good. One thing I will say is that it would assist the Committee greatly if at some point we could get a final, clean version of all the conditions so they can be incorporated into the proposed decision.

MR. GALATI: Yes, we can do that.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

Let's see. I take it then that you would want to be ordered to go workshop some of the other topics.

MS. DeCARLO: One additional item. You skipped Land Use. I was wondering if we could enter staff's Land Use testimony by declaration?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's right, I did skip that because applicant's testimony was withdrawn. And so it's entered by stipulation on the declarations of staff only.

MR. GALATI: That's correct.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good.

MS. DeCARLO: And we'll reserve Visual Resources for after the workshop. I think that was the one remaining item.

MR. GALATI: Yes, thank you.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Right. Okay, good.

So you still have issues to talk about in Visual

Resources, Soil and Water, Biological Resources, Cultural
Resources and Traffic and Transportation. But you're making
progress and there's strong potential to come to resolution,
or closer to resolution at any rate, through some
continuation of your workshops. Am I correct about that?

MR. GALATI: That's correct.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. And you're prepared to proceed in that fashion today?

MR. GALATI: Yes we are. I think the only remaining -- I know we have public comment today at 5:30.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, yes.

MR. GALATI: And so I think what we need to do is to determine what time we should reconvene for purposes of hearing that evidence.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, perhaps we should remain flexible and you tell us when you're ready. The Committee and I have this entire day reserved for this project. I think what we can do is go back to our offices. you know how to reach me. Call me or email me and let me know and I'll get the Committee assembled and we'll come back at that time.

MR. GALATI: That works for us. We'll be in the building.

MS. DeCARLO: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I am just thinking about

the people in the audience and those on the phone. How to know when to come back.

Could you estimate a time for me when you might know for sure when you would be ready?

MR. GALATI: Three o'clock.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well, all right. If you want to just come back at 3:00. If you're ready sooner then you can have lunch. (Laughter).

I think in fairness we do have to give a time certain so that those on the phone and those in the audience will know when to come back and not possibly miss anything.

MS. DeCARLO: Although our Aviation expert won't be available until 2:00, so does an hour give us enough time to discuss that issue. We may want a little bit more.

MR. GALATI: How about if we come back at 3:00. you can always saw we can reconvene in another 45 minutes if we're close.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Sounds good to me, all right. So that will be the Committee Order. The workshop will continue on those topics. Those on the phone, members of the public, those in the audience. We will adjourn until 3:00 o'clock, at which time we will be back here. We will reopen the phone line at that time. Those of you who phoned in, use the same procedure that you used this morning.

Anything from the Committee?

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: I just want to thank the parties for working hard at this and working through the issues. I know reaching settlements require a give and take and all sides and certainly appreciate the effort to get a satisfactory resolution to all the parties. Thanks again.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you. We're adjourned until 3:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, the Evidentiary Hearing was adjourned at 10:47 a.m. to conduct a workshop to discuss outstanding issues.)

--000--

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, it's 3:00 o'clock, we are back on the record. It's 3:10, we are back on the record in the Evidentiary Hearing for the Blythe Solar Power Project.

We previously did introductions and I think we will dispense with that at this time. People on the phone, just say something so we know it's working.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Hello. Okay, good.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Anyone on the phone care to introduce themselves so we'll know who is listening? You don't have to.

MR. BACHRACH: This is Ari Bachrach from AECOM, consultants to Solar Millennium.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. Anyone else?

MR. NEUMAN: Jason Neuman, Riverside County Fire.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good. Anyone else?

MR. MASSER: Mark Masser, BLM.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good, thank you.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Magdalena Rodriguez, Fish and

23 Game.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you very much.

MS. ENGELHARD: Tannika Engelhard, Fish and

Wildlife.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

I'll tell you what, in the interest of an accurate record I am going to go back and ask you, even though it will take a minute or two, to spell your names for the benefit of the record so that we can have an accurate record.

THE REPORTER: I got all the names.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Never mind. I'm being told that we got the spellings during the break so never mind. All right.

So staff and applicant, you have been workshopping and who would care to bring us up to speed here?

MR. GALATI: I'll go ahead if you don't mind.

I'm pleased to report that we have agreement on the conditions of certification of Soil and Water so do not need to present live testimony.

What our plan is we were so productive on the topic areas we unfortunately did not get to Traffic and Transportation. So what we would like to do is have evidentiary hearing and put on live testimony for you in the area of -- very limited. The only area that we have a dispute in Biology has to do with one condition on the Bighorn Sheep.

So our plan was that we would go to evidentiary hearing and take evidence on that limited issue. Ask you to

reconvene at public comment and allow us to continue to workshop the airport issue.

We also, I'm told, have agreement on Cultural Resources and the document is being prepared that we hope to use as a stipulation. I think a special thanks to the cultural people, they have been working on that since ten o'clock today.

I think we also resolved visual. We'll be modifying our testimony to withdraw our objections on Visual to the conditions of certification.

And I think that's pretty much it.

MS. DeCARLO: And then just the agreement on the Hazardous Materials -- Worker Safety 7, I'm sorry.

MR. GALATI: And we did and I made that change. So what we thought we would do is give you a very short commercial on Biology, Bighorn Sheep. Let you go do some additional work until public comment while we work on airport. After public comment we would then have the documents cleaned enough to actually enter into the record. And if we're successful we could close out airport -- Traffic and Transportation and airport. If not our experts are coming tomorrow to resolve that. But I think we're making quite a bit of progress. I think it's just a matter of producing the documents now.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good, thank you.

Ms. DeCarlo, anything to add to that?

MS. DeCARLO: No, nothing to add.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good.

So one thing that occurs to me is we might -- to the extent any of the testimony that has been admitted has changed we will need to have revised declarations. I'm not sure that is going to be necessary but if it has changed we'll need it.

MR. GALATI: Correct. I don't think anything has changed from what we've admitted so far. The Revised Staff Assessment will but I think we have enough witnesses here to sponsor the exhibits we planned to show you what's changed.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good.

So you would like to proceed with Biological Resources then?

MR. GALATI: You bet. I'd like to call the applicant's biological panel. So that would be Bill Graham and I don't know if -- Jen, would you like to be sworn to assist at all?

Whereupon,

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

# BILL GRAHAM

# JENNIFER GUIGLIANO

23 Were duly sworn.

THE REPORTER: Can you please state and spell your names for the record.

MR. GRAHAM: My name is William Graham, W-I-L-I-A-M, G-R-A-H-A-M.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

MS. GUIGLIANO: Jennifer Guigliano, G-U-I-G-L-I-A-

N-O.

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. GALATI: I'm going to direct these questions to Mr. Graham.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. GALATI:

Q Mr. Graham, for the preparation for the evidentiary hearing did you prepare testimony as part of a panel for Biological Resources. It's entitled Exhibit 52.

A Yes I did.

Q And do you have any -- well, did you also prepare rebuttal testimony as part of the panel? And that's identified as Exhibit 53.

A Yes.

Q And in your rebuttal testimony did you provide testimony regarding -- in response to CURE's witness, Dr. Bleich's Bighorn Sheep testimony? Did you provide responses to that?

- A Yes I did in conjunction with my staff.
- Q And did staff require mitigation for Bighorn 25 Sheep?

A Did staff require mitigation for Bighorn Sheep?

Are you speaking about did our own staff require mitigation for Bighorn Sheep?

- Q I apologize. Did California Energy Commission staff in the Revised Staff Assessment propose mitigation for Bighorn Sheep?
  - A Yes.

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q And did they identify impacts to Bighorn Sheep?
- A No, they did not.
- Q And could you explain that to us.
- A Well, they identified impacts to potential foraging habitat and impacts to potential efforts to reintroduce sheep to the McCoy Mountains adjacent to the site.
- Q Do you believe the McCoy Mountains are currently occupied by Bighorn Sheep?
- A I believe there is no evidence that they are currently occupied. They are mapped by the relevant biological management document as unoccupied. We had many hundreds of hours of biological field time out on the site during a springtime after ample rainfall, saw no evidence of Bighorn Sheep foraging on-site.

There was also an eagle survey conducted this year. And admittedly it was not a protocol Bighorn Sheep survey. However, I would like to note that the mountain

ranges that are mapped as unoccupied by the NECO plan were in fact unoccupied as far as the helicopter survey went. And those mountains which are mapped as occupied did, in fact, have adult sheep and lambs that were noted in those helicopter surveys.

Q Do you have an estimate about how far away the project is from those mapped areas of occupation?

A It looks -- based on the scale here it's a relatively crude scale. But it looks like the closest -- on the NECO plan it looks like the closest occupied mountain range would be about 15 miles away as the crow flies.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Excuse me, Mr. Graham. It looks like you're referring to a document.

MR. GRAHAM: I'm referring to Figure 7, Biological Resources, from the -- I'm not sure of the exact -- it's the Biological Resources map showing Bighorn Sheep management areas in the NECO plan.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MR. GALATI: That's specifically out of Exhibit 200, the Revised Staff Assessment, the Biological Resources section.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Perfect, thank you.

MR. GALATI: Is there anything you would like to add as to why you don't believe the project would impact Bighorn Sheep or foraging habitat?

MR. GRAHAM: I believe that -- as I said, it was a year of ample rainfall. I think the forage for Bighorn Sheep would have been much better this year than most years. And I believe with the level of biological survey activity on the site combined with the helicopter surveys that were done I believe that evidence of sheep would have been found. Absent that evidence I see no reason why a determination should be made that our project would impact Bighorn Sheep.

MR. GALATI: I don't have any further questions.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, cross-examination.

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

### BY MS. DeCARLO:

- Q Mr. Graham, do the McCoy Mountains have the potential to be occupied by Bighorn Sheep?
- A It would have the potential to be occupied by Bighorn Sheep, yes.
- Q And in your initial analysis in the AFC did you conclude that the potential for occupancy in the buffer area was high?
  - A I don't recall a definition of a high potential.
- MS. GUIGLIANO: I believe in the AFC the determination or the statement was that there was a potential. Only a potential, no documented proof. But a potential for seasonal forage on the site.

MS. DeCARLO: Can I direct you to page 5.3-28 in Exhibit 1? Maybe I can, if that's going to take too long I can -- it represents a chart entitled Special Status Wildlife Species Relevant to the Proposed Project Potentially Occurring in the BRSA. Survey results and discussion. Potential for occurrence within the disturbance area present for Nelson's Bighorn Sheep. Potential occurrence for occurrence within the buffer, high.

MR. GALATI: Is that the AFC Volume I or Volume

MR. GRAHAM: Volume I.

BY MS. DeCARLO:

II?

Q Does that refresh your memory about your testimony?

A That table was, that table was made at a point very early in our, in our process of investigating biological resources on the site. And it was, it was done strictly on the basis of, of information that was derived from other sources. We did not have the benefit of the work that was done out there this year.

And part of our determination at that time was based on the finding in our initial survey activity of some scat, which originally was thought to potentially be Bighorn Sheep scat. But ourselves and staff later determined that it in fact was Mule Deer scat.

Q But you originally thought that Bighorn Sheep were present on the site, correct?

A We thought that there was the, there was a potential for Bighorn Sheep to be present in the adjacent mountains and to potentially use the site as forage.

Q And nothing you have learned since then has changed your mind about that potential, is that correct?

A I would say that our -- we would think that the potential -- our determination at this time would be that the potential is much lower based on, as I said, a determination that no such occupation and no such foraging activity was observed after a year if ample rainfall.

- Q Lower maybe but still the potential?
- A Yes there is a potential.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay, thank you.

That concludes my cross.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Redirect?

MR. GALATI: No redirect.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. You may step down, thank you.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I'm sorry, I should ask,

23 questions from the Committee?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: No.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: No.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, thank you. All right. Is that the extent of the biological testimony or is there more? MR. GALATI: That's it. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's it. All right, good. And what would you like to do next? MS. DeCARLO: Staff would like to call its panel 8 of experts. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Go ahead, please. 10 MS. DeCARLO: Okay, great. I have several, 11 several on the phone and several here as well. Susan Sanders, Amy Golden, Sara Keeler. Magdalena Rodriguez from 12 13 Fish and Game and Mark Masser from BLM are on the phone. 14 And they all need to be sworn in. 15 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Those present come on up to the table. 16 17 Whereupon, 18 SUSAN SANDERS 19 AMY GOLDEN 20 SARA KEELER 21 MAGDALENA RODRIGUEZ 22 MARK MASSER 23 Were duly sworn. 24 MS. DeCARLO: And Amy and Sara will just be 25 available in case we need to call on them.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good.

MS. KLEBANER: And I should also note that Tannika Engelhard from US Fish and Wildlife Service is also on the phone. She is available to answer questions from the Committee and to comment. However, due to US Fish and Wildlife Service regulations she cannot be subject to cross examination.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you. Will you be asking her any questions?

MS. DeCARLO: I will just be asking her to comment. If she has any comments on staff's analysis.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Fine, thank you. Good.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. De CARLO:

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Dr. Sanders, did you help prepare the testimony entitled Biological Resources in the Revised Staff
Assessment, Exhibit 200?

A Yes.

Q Was a statement of your qualifications attached to this testimony?

A It was.

Q Did you prepare the supplemental testimony entitled Biological Resources in the Supplemental Staff

Assessment, Exhibit 202?

- A I did.
- Q And do the opinions contained in the testimony you are sponsoring represent your best professional judgment?
  - A They do.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. De CARLO:

Q Mr. Masser, did you help assist in the preparation of Biological Resources in the Revised Staff Assessment,

Exhibit 200?

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

- 11 A I did.
- Q And was a statement of your qualifications included in the Supplemental Staff Assessment, Exhibit 202?
  - A Yes they were.
  - Q And do the opinions contained in this testimony you are sponsoring represent your best professional judgment?
    - A Yes.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY MS. De CARLO:

- Q Ms. Rodriguez, did you help prepare the testimony entitled Biological Resources in the Revised Staff
  Assessment, Exhibit 200?
- 24 A I did.
  - Q And did you also help prepare the supplemental

testimony entitled Biological Resources in the Supplemental Staff Assessment, Exhibit 202?

A I did.

Q Was a statement of your qualifications included in the Supplemental Staff Assessment?

A Yes.

Q And do the opinions contained in the testimony you are sponsoring represent your best professional judgment?

A Yes.

### RESUMED DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MS. De CARLO:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Dr. Sanders, can you please discuss your analysis of impacts to Bighorn Sheep and the mitigation you proposed to mitigate those impacts.

A Certainly. Bighorn Sheep are a BLM-sensitive species and a California fully protected species. They occur in steep, rocky terrain in desert mountains. An important part of their life history is in the spring when there is forage in the washes, when the annuals bloom in the washes and are available, they come down out of the mountains and forage on those annuals. And it's a very important part of their life cycle.

Even though it's not a long period it's an important period. The vegetation in those washes has high nutrient availability, it has water. It also happens to

occur at a time that's crucial for the life history of the sheep. Often ewes that are gestating or that have recently given birth rely on those as important nutrient sources.

So in BLM's management of Bighorn Sheep they not only like to protect the desert mountains in which they all live but also the spring foraging habitat that occurs on the alluvium or the bajada that's at the base of the mountains.

So in our analysis of impacts of the project to Bighorn we -- you should note that BLM manages Bighorn Sheep with WHMAs, Wildlife Habitat Management Area. The project itself is not in a WHMA. But the buffer area, the one mile area around it is, because that's close to the McCoy Mountains there.

So it was our conclusion, based on our analysis of what the project would impact and make unavailable to Bighorn Sheep, is that it would impact a pretty wide swath of desert dry wash woodland and other important foraging habitat for Bighorns.

There is no current evidence of occupancy in the McCoy Mountains, the nearest mountains to the project site, but no systematic surveys have been done for this species. Aerial surveys for eagles is not considered a systematic survey. So the fact that they were not detected during those aerial surveys for Golden Eagles does not indicate the absence of Bighorn Sheep. They are hard to find. They're

secretive and sparse and not very abundant.

So to mitigate for the loss of foraging habitat -- and I should also add. And Mark and Magdalena, you know a lot about recent records. While there is no evidence of occupancy right now in the McCoys, nearby in the Little Marias south of the Chuckwallas, the Palen, the Granite, there are evidence of current, not just roaming male Bighorn Sheep but lambs, which means that there's actually occupied habitat in the Little Marias nearby.

And these animals move widely. Fish and Game and BLM would like to reserve the McCoy Mountains as something that could be either reoccupied by natural means, which happens, or a deliberate introduction happens to expand their range.

Bighorn Sheep have declined a lot in the past 140 years. The Southern Mojave metapopulation, which is the one that the project area is in, roads have fragmented it.

Development has really split up the population, it is much sparser than it used to be. So both BLM and Fish and Game are very concerned about any impacts to this species.

So our mitigation, consulting with experts and with Mark and Magdalena. The mitigation that we devised was to supply a new water source, either in the McCoy Mountains or other mountain ranges.

Now I have to explain that water source is not,

it's not like putting a bowl of water out for a dog. A water source for Bighorn Sheep is a management tool and you direct and manage for the population by putting a permanent water source. Because what that does is expand their foraging opportunities. Suppose it's good foraging habitat, good escape cover in mountains but no perennial water source. Well they won't use it even though all the other limiting factors are there. If you add a water source you've enhanced, you've made that available where it wasn't available before. So it's a widely used tool.

And I'm going to refer you to Exhibit 200, the figure that Mr. Graham was referring to earlier. It's Figure 7, I don't know if you have access to it. If you have the whole document open it's PDF page 552 if you want to go to that. And for those of you that don't have it in front of you, what you see on this -- this is a map from the NECO plan, the Northern Eastern Colorado Desert Management Plan. Is that right, Mark? That's what the NECO is. That's the plan that guides all the development in that part of BLM land.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's Exhibit 200?

DR. SANDERS: This is Exhibit 200. And when I found it on the PDF it was 552, Figure 7, Bighorn Sheep WHMAs, W-H-M-A-s.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: So this is the June 4th

RSA?

DR. SANDERS: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. I have to --

DR. SANDERS: Is that working?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: -- identify them all one way or another. Okay, now PDF page again, I'm sorry.

DR. SANDERS: Five-five-two.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, 552. Voilà, got it.

DR. SANDERS: Is that coming up? Okay. You will see all those blue dots. Those are natural or artificial water sources. And that's what I'm saying about water sources. They are really important to management of the species; so much so that they map them all. So our mitigation measure, which had the support of experts that we consulted, was to either enhance an existing water source or create a new one.

Now we had some discussions with the applicant. This was objectionable to them. And so in the course of our workshop, I think last night, we added another component to this mitigation to give an option. If the applicant chose to do so they could acquire compensatory habitat which would be within the Southern Mojave metapopulation, which would compensate for something close to 1,000 acres, which we calculated was the lost spring foraging habitat.

And if possible they could perhaps dovetail this mitigation with their desert tortoise obligations. It's not impossible to do that. They are not exactly coincident. So there was an option for the applicant to do either of those, either create a new water source or acquire compensatory mitigation habitat. And that's the BIO-21 that we have been discussing.

Mark and Magdalena, please, I probably have forgotten some things. Do you want to add anything to what I've said?

MR. MASSER: What you said is perfect, I think. When you're done, I guess if we have an opportunity to provide anything else we will.

DR. SANDERS: Okay. Do you have any more -Magdalena, I know you supplied us with some information
about recent finds of Bighorn Sheep, which I didn't really
recount because I couldn't recall the exact details. Do you
want to add anything about other findings, recent findings
of Bighorn Sheep in the area?

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Just that if you look at the NECO plan it shows that the Little Marias and the Big Marias are unoccupied, the same as it shows the McCoys. However, recently last year, I think it was in November and December, I think it was in December, there was a ram that was killed in-between the Big Marias and the Riverside Mountains.

They're assuming that it was in the north part of the Big Marias. So that documents an animal moving within those ranges that were originally considered unoccupied.

And then in addition there was some scat that was collected in the Little Marias. And DNA testing was done on that which documented that there were not only males but females in the Little Marias. So that's the most recent finding, that was in 2009.

MR. MASSER: I also want to add that the scat that was found by the applicant wasn't collected and it wasn't tested so we don't know for sure the species for the scat.

DR. SANDERS: Just to follow up on Magdalena's remark. Is the area in which there was actually a carcass of a Bighorn Sheep found is marked on this NECO map as unoccupied, the same as the McCoy Mountains, the mountain range near the project site. So these data, the NECO data are old and don't reflect the most current information or even, you know, it's not definitive. Just because it's marked as unoccupied doesn't mean that it always is going to be unoccupied.

MR. MASSER: And I want to emphasize that even the unoccupied ranges, the McCoys and the Big and Little Marias, the NECO plan still considers those areas to be very important. That's why they are designated as Bighorn Sheep wildlife habitat management areas. We don't want to

preclude future occupancy of those ranges.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. That concludes your direct? Does that conclude your direct testimony? All right, cross examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF MS. RODRIGUEZ

#### BY MR. GALATI:

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Q Does any of the panel, has anybody have knowledge of an observation of Bighorn Sheep in the McCoy Mountains?

A I don't have personal knowledge. However -- this is Magdalena, sorry.

However, the expert that I consulted within CDFG had stated that a warden -- about 10 to 15 years ago a warden that was stationed in Blythe saw Bighorn Sheep rams at the base of the McCoy near I-10. It's not written in anywhere so, I mean, I can't substantiate that but that's based on personal conversation.

- Q Right. And that's a conversation that the person that I believe lieutenant --
  - A I'm sorry?
- Q That's Lieutenant Richard Colby, who is now deceased, told Mr. Mulcahy, is that correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q Okay. I just would note for the record that that's a couple layers of hearsay.
  - A Correct.

Q Is there any other evidence other than the evidence that they are in the Little Marias and the Big Marias and the scat on the site that wasn't tested that would lead you to conclude that the site -- excuse me, that the McCoy Mountains could be occupied?

A I'm sorry. So are you saying is there any other evidence than what I just told you? That was the question?

Q Yes.

A No.

Q On page, on page C.2-38 of the staff assessment. That's Exhibit 200, the Revised Staff Assessment. Three paragraphs down, the very last sentence says:

"Based on information provided by the Applicant (AECOM 2010a, Data Response BIO-53) and consultation with experts (Rodriguez, personal communication), staff believes it is more likely that the sign found during spring 2009 surveys was burro deer."

Is that still accurate?

A Well, based on conversation, yeah, we had no proof that it was otherwise. However, the scat wasn't tested so we don't know for sure.

Q So isn't the mitigation being proposed to try to mitigate what might be a future impact should the McCoy Mountains be re -- excuse me, Bighorn Sheep be reintroduced

to the McCoy Mountains?

A Is that directed to me? I'm sorry.

MR. GALATI: Actually to any of you, I apologize. To anybody on the panel.

MR. MASSER: I don't think we have evidence that the McCoys are not occupied. We haven't done surveys during the proper time of the year.

DR. SANDERS: And to add to that. I think it is for direct, current and future impacts.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF DR. SANDERS

## BY MR. GALATI:

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q And so in order to determine that there is a direct, current impact you have to assume that the McCoy Mountains are occupied by Bighorn Sheep, correct?

A I think that is the assumption we're making is that they could be occupied right now and they could be occupied in the future.

Q And the evidence of that is what has been discussed here today.

A We don't have systematic confirmed surveys that would allow us to conclude that there are no bighorns in the McCoy mountains.

MR. GALATI: May I have one moment, please.

How far away is our project site from the Big

25 Maria Mountains?

DR. SANDERS: I'm not sure. Mark or Magdalena, can you answer that?

MR. MASSER: I don't know exactly but the western half is well within a mile of the mountains, of the McCoys.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF MR. MASSER

### BY MR. GALATI:

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q That's of the McCoys though, correct?
- A Yes. Is that --
- Q I apologize, the question is directed to the Big Maria Mountains. How far away is the project from the Big Maria Mountains?
- A I don't know exactly but it's probably 12 or 15 miles to the east. The Big Marias are -- yeah.
  - O And how about the Little Marias Mountains?
  - A Probably an equal distance to the north.
- Q Do you know how far the Genesis Project site is from the Palen Mountains?
- A I don't know exactly but I think the tip of the Genesis Project is four or five miles from the base of the Palen Mountains.
  - MR. GALATI: No further questions.
  - HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Any redirect?
- MS. DeCARLO: No redirect. Though I would like to ask the US Fish and Wildlife Service, Ms. Engelhard, if she has any comments on the staff's analysis.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Please, we'd like to hear that.

MS. ENGELHARD: I don't have any --

MR. GALATI: Just a minute. If I could just provide an objection because I can't cross-examine this witness.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes.

MR. GALATI: And this is not a US Fish and Wildlife Service jurisdictional animal. I'm not sure that this is relevant, especially since I can't ask her any questions.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Well.

MR. GALATI: I guess if you accept it as comment and not testimony.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think we'll accept --

MS. DeCARLO: She has not been sworn so we wouldn't indicate that this was testimony.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think it would be viewed as comment by someone knowledgeable in the field.

MS. DeCARLO: By a US Fish and Wildlife Service representative.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Who is a biologist, I think, right?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes, yes.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think we'd like to hear

that. We'll give it the weight it's due. Go ahead.

MS. ENGELHARD: Okay. This is Tannika Engelhard, Fish and Wildlife Service. And I actually don't have any additional comments to add to what CEC, BLM and CDFG staff have already stated.

MS. DeCARLO: Thanks.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

Questions by the Committee? Anybody?

I do have one for Dr. Sanders or whoever from the staff. I have been following along Figure 7, PDF page 552 of Exhibit 200. And at the bottom there's a, I guess we call it a legend, describing the number of acres affected. And when it comes to affected by the Blythe Solar Power Project it says zero acres and I'm curious to understand exactly what that means. By "affected" I think is what I'm, the word I'm puzzled about.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: The witness who is most qualified to answer this wasn't sworn because it was the botanist Carolyn Chainey-Davis who did the cumulative, but I think I can answer.

The data layers that were used for that analysis were the WHMAs that were designated as Bighorn Sheep wildlife habitat management areas. And as I said, the project area does not overlap with the WHMA, the buffer does, it's very near. And that was the reason. Since that

was the basis for the analysis, just the designated NECO WHMAs, the project did not show any impact. But this NECO layer doesn't include the spring foraging habitat that we were discussing.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: You say it does not include?

DR. SANDERS: Does not include.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: So are you saying that perhaps you wouldn't describe it as a direct impact at the site but some sort of an indirect impact that spreads from the site?

DR. SANDERS: Let me clarify. This calculation in this little box down here was strictly referring to the NECO mapping that was done. It wasn't a site-specific assessment of what an impact to a certain area would have to Bighorn Sheep habitat. It's simply -- and Mark, please jump in because I'm here talking about BLM NECO layers and you know more than anybody. But the fact that there was no impact detected in this analysis just indicates the NECO layers didn't show up. The WHMA that was offsite, a mile or so offsite, was not directly impacted by the project footprint. And Mark, if you want to add anything to that you're welcome to do so.

MR. MASSER: I guess the only thing I'd want to add is that the WHMA boundaries do not include the spring

foraging habitat for some unknown reason. And that's -HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good.

Another question then. Your recommendation is, provide a new water source or compensatory habitat. Will we get any more specifics about those recommendations?

DR. SANDERS: I think the applicant has prepared Exhibit 66. We do have a condition right now in there for the spring foraging and then last night we added the alternative that was for acquisition. And that will be submitted in the next few hours, I believe. But if you want to see the condition regarding the spring foraging water source, that's on BIO-21 and I can find the page if you'd like to look at that.

MR. GALATI: I currently have that marked as -- to show you how cooperative that we have all been it's an applicant exhibit for a condition that they do not want to comply with. It's Exhibit 66. Because we have been working on the language as well and we actually have a modification of that. So what I would give you now actually needs to have a number revision in it. But we certainly can, after public comment, enter that along with the rest of the conditions into the record. And this is one that we're disputing the need for.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, very good.

That's it then? Anything further?

MR. GALATI: No, nothing further from the applicant. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: From the staff? MS. DeCARLO: Nothing from staff. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you. My notes show you were also talking about a raven management plan and tortoise mitigation lands. Do we have 8 testimony about hat as well? MR. GALATI: We have reached an accord. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, good. 10 11 MR. GALATI: And we'll enter that into the record after public comment. 12 13 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, very good, 14 thank you. So what topic would you like to proceed with? 15 MR. GALATI: We'd like to give you guys a break until 5:30. 16 17 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. 18 MR. GALATI: And continue with our workshop on 19 Traffic and Transportation. 20 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. So you'll 21 remain in here? 22 MR. GALATI: Oh, I'm sorry, Lisa.

-- did we want to enter in Soil and Water now so that our

Soil and Water folks could go home or did we need more time

MS. DeCARLO: I can't remember if we had resolved

23

24

25

on that?

MR. GALATI: I apologize. I guess we can enter Soil and Water now.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay. I'd like to call -- or did you want to call your -- were you going to do it by declaration? I have my witnesses here.

MR. GALATI: Yeah. I'm just going to do, if there's no objection, an offer of proof through counsel that we agree.

MS. DeCARLO: Do we have an exhibit number for -- do we have a packet of the changes?

MR. GALATI: Do you guys, do you guys --

MS. DeCARLO: Okay. So this will be marked

Exhibit 210. And my witnesses are Michael Donovan and John

15 Thornton and they need to be sworn.

Whereupon,

# MICHAEL DONOVAN

# JOHN THORNTON

19 Were duly sworn.

THE REPORTER: Please state and spell your names for the record.

MR. THORNTON: It's John Thornton, T-H-O-R-N-T-O-

23 N.

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

MR. DONOVAN: Michael Donovan, D-O-N-O, V as in

25 Victor, A-N.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MS. DeCARLO:

- Q Mr. Donovan, did you prepare the testimony titled Soil and Water Resources in the Revised Staff Assessment, Exhibit 200?
  - A Yes I did.
- Q Was a statement of your qualifications attached to this testimony?
- A Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

20

21

22

- Q Did you prepare the supplemental testimony titled Soil and Water Resources in the Supplemental Staff Assessment, Exhibit 202?
  - A Yes I did.
- Q Do the opinions contained in this testimony you are sponsoring represent your best professional judgment?
- 17 A Yes they do.

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

- 19 BY MS. DeCARLO:
  - Q Mr. Thornton, did you prepare the testimony entitled Soil and Water Resources in the Revised Staff Assessment, Exhibit 200?
- 23 A I did.
- Q Was a statement of your qualifications attached to this testimony?

- A Yes it was.
- Q And the opinions contained in this testimony you are sponsoring represent your best professional judgment?
  - A They do.

- Q Can you please -- do you have Exhibit 210 before you, the Blythe Solar Power Project Soil and Water Resources Conditions of Certification?
  - A Yes I do, I've got it.
- Q Do these conditions of certification represent changes to the previous conditions made in conjunction with discussions with the applicant?
  - A Yes, this was during our workshop today.
- Q And do these changes -- can you please describe how these conditions of certification affect your conclusions regarding soil and water resources and the potential for the Blythe Solar Power Project to impact those resources.

A Yes. These conditions address all of the potential significant impacts that the Blythe Solar Project would occur to soil and water resources. These changes were associated mostly with a disagreement between the applicant and the Energy Commission with regard to impacts to the Colorado River. We have come to an agreement with respect to addressing those impacts to -- with respect to the project pumping and surface water sources. And so we feel

that the soil and water conditions of certification address all significant impacts.

- Q And does this conclude your testimony?
- A This concludes my testimony.

MS. DeCARLO: The witness is available.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you. Cross examination.

MR. GALATI: May I have just a moment to talk to Ms. DeCarlo?

MS. DeCARLO: Oh-oh.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Of course. We'll go off the record then while they confer.

(Off the record for a brief conference.)

### RESUMED DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. DeCARLO:

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Mr. Donovan, can you please discuss changes, two changes that you agree with to Exhibit 210 that Mr. Galati pointed out.

A Yes. With respect to Condition 16, which is under the heading of estimation of Colorado River impacts. That should read, estimation of surface water impacts.

And the same thing in respect to Soil & Water 16,

Item 1, where it says "The project owner shall conduct a

detailed analysis of contribution of Colorado River water."

It should read, "contribution of surface water to the

### PBMGB."

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q And do these changes affect your conclusion that there will be no significant unmitigated impacts?

A No, there will be no significant impact from these changes.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay, the witness is available for cross.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

### BY MR. GALATI:

Q I just have one question, Mr. Donovan. Do you believe the Blythe Solar Power Project needs an entitlement for Colorado River water to be able to pump groundwater on the mesa?

A No.

MR. GALATI: No further questions.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Cross (sic)?

MS. DeCARLO: None.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you.

Does that conclude the testimony on Soil and Water then?

MR. GALATI: Yes that does, for me.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Let's see.

You had mentioned an offer of proof, Mr. Galati.

You had mentioned an offer of proof at some point. Is that no longer needed?

MR. GALATI: I think when I move in the rest of my

testimony I probably am going to say, you know, as modified by the later exhibits.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, okay, very good.

MR. GALATI: I didn't think I need, unless the Committee does, think I needed a live witness to be able to do that.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: No, no.

MR. GALATI: Okay, thanks.

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. So does that mean you want to go back to your workshop at this point?

MS. DeCARLO: If we could, on aviation. Yeah, the Traffic and Transportation aviation assessment.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MR. GALATI: Yes, please.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Very good. So those of you on the phone, the line will remain open. The workshop is public, if you wish to listen you may. Those of you here, you may also stay if you wish. We'll come back at 5:30 for public comment. Thank you. The evidentiary hearing is adjourned until 5:30.

(Whereupon, the Evidentiary Hearing was adjourned at 3:52 p.m. to conduct a workshop to discuss outstanding issues.)

--000--

# EVENING SESSION

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: We will reconvene the evidentiary hearing in the Blythe Solar Power Project. Welcome back.

We noticed the public comment period to take place at this time. Those who are present and wish to submit a public comment please fill out one of these blue cards. I have one already. They are on the podium in the back. The Public Adviser, Jennifer Jennings, can help you with that.

Is there anyone on the telephone who wishes to make a public comment about the Blythe project?

(No response.)

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is there anyone on the telephone at all? If you could just let us know its working.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good, thank you, okay.

Well. And is there anyone in the room who has not submitted a blue card who wants to make a public comment?

All right, I'll call Daniel Curtin.

MR. CURTIN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,

Commissioner Weisenmiller, we have not met. I saw you at
the hearing a couple of days ago.

I have yet to circulate this letter from our general president -- I'm sorry.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Would you state your name

and who you represent, please.

MR. CURTIN: I will. My name is Daniel Curtin.

I'm the director of the California Conference of Carpenters.

I wanted to come to the hearing to let you know that we fully support this project. And in fact we are very enthusiastic about all of the renewable projects that are before you.

We respect and are beginning to understand the depth of detail that you must go through to get these projects sited but we encourage you to do that as quickly as possible. And I'm sure we are not the only ones encouraging you to do that.

I had sent a letter or got a letter sent by our general president to Commissioner Weisenmiller and Commissioner Boyd because we attended Tuesday's hearing. I would like to get a copy to you and Commissioner Douglas as well, sort of outlining the carpenters' general position on this. Which is, as I said, in support of these projects.

But we also at that hearing made it clear that we are very concerned about the tactics of some of the organizations, or a specific organization, which I think will become clear in a minute, regarding their concerns about ecology, biology, environmental issues. That would be CURE specifically. And I think today's, what happened today would highlight my comments from the other day.

So basically our general president asked the Commissioners and the Commission in general to take very skeptically the concerns of an organization that is basically a union organization with economic interests when it comes to biological, ecological, environmental issues before this Commission. Now we know they have that right. Everybody actually has that right, we respect that. But the motivations are also quite important.

And I guess today they actually withdrew their objections from this project because they proudly announced that they have an agreement. And frankly that only highlights my concerns. That their objections using this process, which is a very, very important process, are fundamentally untruthful in the sense that they are -- and I wish they were here because it is always more fun to have this conversation when the parties involved are here. When they are fundamentally only concerned about using this process to extract, I'll be polite, extort, not so polite, a labor agreement for the construction of these facilities.

Now we are not opposed to labor agreements, we're a union. But what I said on Tuesday and I want to repeat. These issues are so profoundly important. We are not building gas stations, we are not building strip malls. We are building really the most important industrial developments for the future of the planet.

This is the, I think, equivalent to the industrial revolution. We are moving from fossil-based fuels which have gotten us into a situation that is beginning to look more and more untenable to everybody except maybe a few holdouts. And this is the methodology we are going to use to get the planet out of this mess. And we have very, very aggressive policies in California leading in that direction and we happy to be a part of those. We were a part of that legislation. We've worked with the administration. We think this is ground zero for building a clean, renewable energy future and it's absolutely critical.

So it only makes it that much more unpalatable that they would use these tactics at this moment in the history of this planet, so to speak. The fact that they have withdrawn and have no longer any concerns that they had just yesterday on biological, ecological, environmental issues really only highlights the comments I made two days, just two days before. If they were really concerned about those issues they'd be here at the table working them out. They magically disappeared because they got what they wanted economically.

Now you could say yes or no and I'm not really here to debate it. But it seems obvious to us, and not just us, obviously, or not so obviously, many, many others, that that's the tactic. And, you know, people have used tactics

for a long period of time. But in this particular case, the considerations of where we are environmentally, we believe this is fundamentally unethical. And we encourage you to take a hard look at what they're doing.

Just to step back one second. We believe that this is an evolving technology and we need innovation in this technology. When you shoehorn an agreement that does not really work for the people who are building these systems then you are going to hold up the technology that is vital to have this approved. To get these systems to finally be economically feasible. Having said that, we believe CURE has used these for very, very narrow purposes and object to it.

Now I want to add one more thing which will be more, even more -- if this isn't controversial, will be more controversial. Not only have they used this process, I think, and abused this process for non-environmental issues, they have actually as part of the agreements they settle on, they are rewarded by money from these agreements to continue this process so that the next applicant that comes in has to face a battery of concerns that are clearly not motivated by what drives this Commission.

So we would like to ask this Commission to look into this. Literally look into this and say, we'd like to see what your agreements actually amount to. And are you

using these agreements to fund continued use or abuse of this process.

If necessary or if better I'll send a letter to that effect, asking the Commission to tell their lawyers to take a look at the agreements that the companies -- And I'm not trying to besmirch the companies in any way, shape or form. They're doing business and they're trying to get this done. But I would like to ask the Commission to ask their attorneys to see if this works.

Now where is my friend Billy Owens back there?

I'm going to talk about Shakespeare for a second here.

There's something rotten in Denmark. This isn't right. And

I just did that for him because he doesn't believe I'd wear

a suit and tie even.

So this is really wrong. We're going to ask the Commission, and I'm asking you verbally now, we need to put a stop to this. Because this is just the beginning of a decade and a half of issues that you're going to be dealing with. Hopefully by then it will be worked out.

We'd like to see you people -- you people. We'd like to see the Commission take a hard look at this and discourage this kind of behavior. It couldn't have been more blatant. Two days ago I'm here to say, be skeptical of their motivations. Two days later all of their concerns are withdrawn because

we have our economic agreement. I don't believe their agreement had much to do with biology and environmentalism, I'm not sure.

And I know you have to walk a very delicate line and you have strong legislative and statutory guidelines. We encourage you to continue being due diligent like you are. It's amazing to watch this process really. It's very, very well done. But we do believe it's abused in this case.

So I'd be happy to -- if there's any questions.

But I just needed to make that statement, to be quite honest.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: Well, I certainly listened to your short comments earlier in the week and the participation of your members and appreciate that. And again, we have a very public process.

MR. CURTIN: Right.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: We certainly encourage participation and a wide range of views. I think certainly our Public Adviser can help you get your comments docketed in this case and the other cases. Again, to make sure that your message is getting out to all the Commissioners. And again, certainly if you have specific questions, you know. And again, please docket those for us.

I know a few years ago -- I was not here but the Commission did respond to I think a legislator's question

about CURE's participation in his cases. So that might be something you want to look at.

MR. CURTIN: Okay.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: But again, I think
-- certainly I want to encourage you to participate in our
cases. I certainly find it very, very encouraging that you
are looking at the job potential of these projects and
looking at ways to innovate there that can reduce cost and
enhance the technology.

MR. CURTIN: As I said, we believe the industry should decide what the work force needs are and then we'll help fit those needs. Not say, here is what your work force needs are, take them or leave them.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: Okay.

MR. CURTIN: If I could get some help on that particular situation where they -- maybe the time period.

MS. DeCARLO: Tracking down the letter. Yes, I know the letter that you're referring to. It's probably about six or seven years ago. It was addressed to, I believe -- it was from the siting division, Robert Therkelsen.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: Right.

MR. CURTIN: Okay.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: But again -- and certainly the Public Adviser is here to help you.

MR. CURTIN: Appreciate that.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: And I think also to encourage you to look generally at stuff. I know it's been a long time ago but at one point at my prior firm, one of the things we did -- we did an assignment with TCW. And basically they were working with the boilermakers who wanted to invest their pension money in renewable projects, particularly projects that had boilermaker content. So again, really deep in the relationship between the alternative energy technology and the unions. So again, there's a lot of interesting things you can do.

MR. CURTIN: Well we're very supportive of continuing along this path, you know. We just want it to be done so that the industry can actually innovate and make this work, because we all need it.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: That's great, thank you.

MR. CURTIN: Thank you for your time.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I should add for the record, though, that you may know more about the agreement than the Commission or the Committee does.

MR. CURTIN: I don't.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: What we heard today was a statement from CURE's attorney and we were given a written statement indicating that their environmental concerns had

been satisfied and it was fairly specific about why.

MR. CURTIN: Um-hmm.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: And there was no mention of any other kind of, as you put it, economic consideration.

MR. CURTIN: Understood.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Now that doesn't mean it doesn't exist. Obviously you're basing your comments on knowledge or an assumption that it does exist.

MR. CURTIN: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: As far as we're concerned we don't know about that.

MR. CURTIN: So since it is public testimony I may not be held to such rigorous standards as the attorneys around the table here, hopefully. But there's a common understanding that the parties that sign these agreements actually contribute to trust funds that we believe fund the intervention. And it's based on 25 cents or so a man hour worked or a person hour worked.

We think there's about 16 million work hours coming up in the next 15 projects, which amounts to \$4 million, which is a pretty good amount of money to work with in terms of intervening in this Commission. So we find that appalling. If that's the case we'd encourage the Commission to look into it. And we will, we'll make a formal request if that's what is necessary.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Thank you.

MR. CURTIN: Thank you. Thank you again.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is there anyone else who wishes to make a public comment, present here in the room?

Is there anyone on the phone who wishes to make a public comment?

No? Hearing none, all right.

MR. GALATI: Mr. Renaud?

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, Mr. Galati.

MR. GALATI: I'd like to just point the Committee in the direction of several public comment letters that were filed in behalf of supporters of the project. There's at least 40 documented letters that have been docketed in the record from local residents and business owners.

In addition a letter from Supervisor John Benoit, a letter from Larry McLaughlin who is with the College of the Desert, David Lane, the Blythe City Manager, Joey DeConinck, the may for the city of Blythe, Sam Patel, which is a Blythe City Council Member, Jim Shipley, Blythe Chamber COO. Wes Ahlgren, who is with the Coachella Valley Economic Partnership, And Jennifer Lambert, the Palo Verde Unified Parent Teacher Organization. So I wanted to make sure that the Committee was aware of that.

We are in Sacramento and not everybody was able to travel and so people that did support the project that you

saw at our site visit/informational hearing filed letters of support for you to consider as well.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: I was going to say, certainly when we had the site visit it was very clear to the Chair and I that there was a lot of support in the community for the project. Obviously we had hoped to go back. But with the budget realities the state is facing we just could not do that. But again, certainly we heard loud and clear from the community when we were there the broad range of support you had.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes, and I've noted that those letters have been arriving and are docketed. I was just checking your exhibit list. I don't think any of them are exhibits.

MR. GALATI: I didn't identify them as an exhibit because I knew they would be public comment.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: And we'll treat them as public comment.

All right, good. Anything else from either party?

MS. DeCARLO: We have a couple of other matters.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MS. DeCARLO: We're through with the public comment section?

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Yes. We'll conclude public comment and we'll go back into the matters remaining

in the evidence process.

Off the record for a moment, please.

(Off the record for a brief discussion.)

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Let me just ask one more time. Are there any public agencies, elected officials, government officials who wish to comment before we close public comment? All right, just double-checking.

MR. GALATI: Mr. Hearing Officer, we have -HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, back on the record,
please.

MR. GALATI: Mr. Renaud, we have created quite a bit of paper today on actually final documents. Staff counsel and I have spoken and we think it might be more efficient if we took one more look at them. And since we are coming back tomorrow, we weren't able to resolve all of our airport aviation issues with Traffic and Transportation, we thought it might be better, more efficient and probably lead to a cleaner PMPD with fewer comments, if we did a little bit more proofing of the documents we have been creating today.

But I believe that we are, if not completely agreed, we are very, very close on Cultural. We have one more review to do.

I believe that other than the issue that you heard on Bighorn Sheep we are completely agreed on Biology.

We wanted to let you know that we also are agreed on Worker Safety and we have a condition here that we'd like to mark. Do you want to enter this now?

MS. DeCARLO: Sure. Could I just get clarification -- confirmation that it does remedy the typographical error in number two of the condition to read \$850,000?

MR. GALATI: Not the version I have but the version on my computer does so we didn't print that one out.

I think I'd like to move that one in tomorrow as well.

MS. DeCARLO: Okay.

MR. GALATI: I made it -- they are both 825. The condition was 825, the verification was 850?

MS. DeCARLO: Yes.

MR. GALATI: Okay.

MS. DeCARLO: No, they're both 850.

MR. GALATI: They're both 850. Okay, we'll talk about it tomorrow.

We also needed to resolve Visual.

MS. DeCARLO: Yeah. I just wanted to confirm or make sure that staff's Visual testimony was entered into the record, I think we left that outstanding. As Scott indicated earlier that he had agreed to withdraw his comments. I just wanted to make sure that staff's testimony was in fact entered by declaration.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: I think it was but if it wasn't let me ask if there is any objection?

MR. GALATI: No objection.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good. Then it will be admitted if it wasn't already.

MS. DeCARLO: Thank you.

MR. GALATI: So I think at this stage we'd prefer to handle the rest of the exhibits at the first part of tomorrow's hearing and then go to Traffic and Transportation.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, very good.

One question that the Committee is interested in asking pertains to the Bighorn Sheep issue that we heard earlier and there may be people here who would be able to answer it. The question is simply with respect to the proposed BIO-21. What is a, what did you call it, artificial water source? What does that look like, how do you make one, what does it cost and so forth? Do we have --- do people have experience with those? Are they effective? Whatever anybody knows about it.

MS. DeCARLO: Dr. Sanders has been previously sworn in.

DR. SANDERS: The people most qualified to answer,

Mark Masser and Magdalena Rodriguez, are not on the phone

anymore. But a guzzler is pretty --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Did you call it a guzzler?

DR. SANDERS: A guzzler, right.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, okay.

DR. SANDERS: It's a source of water that is typically buried. It runs in cost anywhere from something like 10,000 to 50,000 depending on how it's installed. The idea is to get it installed in an area that isn't going to require a road construction or transmission line construction because that increases the impacts.

But it should be a permanent water source collecting water from a natural, immediate watershed so you don't have to pipe water in. And the proposal in BIO-21 is to either restore a natural water source, which maybe is impaired because of changes, hydrological changes upstream or for other reasons, or to create a new one. And the cost is quite variable depending on how it's constructed. So that is about the extent of my knowledge on guzzlers.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Have any specific plans for the suggested one been developed? The location, type, cost, whatever?

DR. SANDERS: That was something that we thought needed an assessment first. And that was what specified in the condition is to identify what the existing water sources are in the appropriate area that would benefit the Southern

Mojave metapopulation.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

DR. SANDERS: See if there's any that could be fixed. That would be the most cost-effective way to do it.

And if not, install one.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Would there be any value in bringing back the two specialists you mentioned, tomorrow?

DR. SANDERS: They would know quite a bit more than I do. I don't know if Bill Graham or Jen are here. Jen?

MS. GUIGLIANO: I can add just a little bit. As Susan mentioned, it is highly variable depending on the type of water source you are going to install. It also depends on whether or not you can access the place to put it. And you could end up with a placement -- in order to have it placed in an effective location you could end up with all sorts of other impacts from the actual installation and/or restoration of a water source.

So the actual cost is not just the cost of the guzzler itself but the cost of the installation, the maintenance, the monitoring that goes with it to determine whether or not it is being used. And all the other aspects that accompany the installation of a guzzler as well as the potential other effects on other wildlife or use by other

wildlife and the implications of that.

I've dealt with guzzlers in the past for other types of wildlife, not for the Bighorn Sheep, and they can be buried below the ground. Some of them can literally be concrete or fabricated structures that are set above the ground. Some can be designed to have to be refilled with a water truck because there isn't, you know, routine water in the desert. Some can be designed to use a natural water source or a flow path to collect water. Hence the variability in the cost is very dependant on the location and the design that's selected.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is the idea then that the animals drink from it or that it provides water for vegetation that they can eat?

MS. GUIGLIANO: The purpose is drinking. A wildlife drinking water source, essentially.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay, all right. Okay, good. Applicant, do you have anything to add to the discussion?

MR. GALATI: No. I can tell you that we did have some discussions -- and again I'm not testifying but I can give the Committee -- I heard, you know, \$50,000 to, I think we had a number that when we started adding up was well over a couple hundred thousand dollars. Again, they were talking about another cost of assessment. You know, helicopter

surveys to find where the best place would be.

So there's quite a bit of work to actually, to locate one that is -- if you find one quickly you don't spend as much money finding it. If you don't find one quickly you can spend a lot of money. But one of the big things that I think that Dr. Sanders said was, you don't cut a road in to get here. So we're talking about remote access and a lot of labor.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Good.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: That's why I assumed that mitigation land became another option.

MR. GALATI: I'm sorry?

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: That's why I assumed that mitigation land became another approach. That presumably it was easier for you to bound.

MR. GALATI: Yeah, that was certainly what we were looking for when we proposed that idea as well. We were hoping that the mitigation lands would be defined in such a way that the fact that the applicant has agreed to mitigate one-to-one for desert tortoise that there could be quite a bit in overlap in the mitigation.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: Right.

MR. GALATI: And we're finding that that may not be the case. So that is our concern. That's why we went back to the original position that we didn't believe we had

an impact.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: I think from the Committee's perspective -- and again the good news is you guys have done a phenomenal job of narrowing the issues; we're down to maybe a couple. But also we're so close to getting this whole thing tied up that we certainly would encourage the parties to sit down and talk one more time about this issue and say, can we at least all get to the point of seeing this whole thing was dealt with, by settlement.

DR. SANDERS: If I could ad one more thing. I know that BLM and Fish and Game stand ready to help advise the applicant as to how they should proceed. And perhaps they could help narrow down the range of costs and give you some idea of less expensive ways to undertake this. Because I know that the water source creation or restoration was their first choice, more so than the acquisition of habitat. So perhaps there is opportunity for -- well, I don't know what the opportunity would be since we are kind of drawing to the end of this process. But I know that they are willing to work with you as much as they can.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: Well again, I think from my perspective, you know, just sort of suggesting people try to talk one more time and see if by rolling up your sleeves you can get this whole thing tied up. And

again, it's not a huge impact I think in terms of a decision or whatever. But I think it will send a very good message for the project in Sacramento to say the whole thing was settled. It was -- otherwise we have to explain, well there was these two issues, but. This could be the perfect game, right?

MR. GALATI: You bet. We'll certainly -- we're sort of out of pitches at the moment though.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: And those discussions can go on even after the evidentiary hearings. We can deal with these things via errata or other procedures.

Just for clarification, my understanding of BIO-21 now is that mitigation lands are no longer in there. That's not -- is that one of the --

DR. SANDERS: That isn't my understanding but perhaps the applicant can clarify. I thought it was an option, they can do either one.

ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: That's what I'm -- HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is it? Okay.

MR. GALATI: Yes. I think that we --

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Is that the latest? All

MR. GALATI: Yes.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Okay. It's an either/or.

MR. GALATI: Yes.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you. I think I was looking at an ancient version, maybe three days ago, you know. (Laughter.)

MR. GALATI: I can't tell you how many times this particular week I have said, a couple of weeks ago or yesterday.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. So schedule-wise, what time should we plan on reconvening? We did notice it for 10:00. Will that work?

MS. DeCARLO: Actually we were hoping to continue this hearing to tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. so staff and the applicant could further discuss aviation issues in a workshop setting, not needing the Hearing Officer or the Commissioners.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: That's fine.

MS. DeCARLO: And then we can proceed at 10:00 o'clock, the normally scheduled time, and kind of get a status update, see where we are.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right.

MS. DeCARLO: If we've made any progress in aviation or if we need to proceed to litigate that issue.

HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. So we'll convene the second session of the evidentiary hearing tomorrow morning at 10:00. You can conduct a workshop before that and at 10:00 we'll at least find out what's

going on and what we should do. MR. GALATI: And I promise you then we'll have these exhibits worked out to where they're perfect. MS. DeCARLO: And just to -- we intend -- our biologists aren't going to be available tomorrow morning so we intend to, absent any problems, file by declaration, file the condition changes by declaration. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: Fine. MS. DeCARLO: If that's okay with the Committee. 10 ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: Yes. 11 HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right. Well, anything else? 12 13 ASSOCIATE MEMBER WEISENMILLER: That's it. HEARING OFFICER RENAUD: All right, thank you 14 15 then. We're adjourning this day of evidentiary hearings and we'll see you tomorrow at 10:00 16 17 (Whereupon, at 6:00 p.m. the Evidentiary 18 Hearing was adjourned, set to reconvene 19 at 10:00 a.m. on July 16, 2010.) 20 --000--21 22 23 24

25

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Evidentiary Hearing; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said hearing, nor in any way interested in outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 19th day of July, 2010.

PETER PETTY, CER\*\*D-493

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

July 19, 2010

RAMONA COTA, CERT\*\*478